

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 6-10 remain in this Application. Claims 3-5 have been canceled without prejudice.

The Examiner's objection to the drawings shown is hereby acknowledged. Applicant respectfully submits that the objection has been overcome by the cancellation of Claims 3 and 4.

Claim 1, the sole independent claim in this Application, has been amended to further define the invention and thereby expedite prosecution of the Application. More specifically, Claim 1 has been amended to further define the adapter housing as including a set-back section. A sliding apparatus is defined as being displaceably seated in the set-back section of the housing for locking the fluorescent lamp. Support for this amending is found throughout the Specification, in particular, page 7, lines 17-20.

Dependent Claim 6-10 have been amended in response to the Examiner's Claim objections/rejections listed on pages 3-4 of the Office Action and to improve the readability of the claims.

Original Claims 1-4 and 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Francescutte et al (WO 99/60672).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Francescutte patent cited by the Examiner as anticipating the invention, does not contain all of the material elements recited in Applicant's present claims. With particular attention to FIGS 1 and 2, Francescutte teaches a tongue 11 having one end attached to a housing 3 and another free end which snaps so as to lock the tube 2 against extension 10 of the housing. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Francescutte fails to disclose the present invention including a sliding apparatus which is displaceably seated in a set-back section of an adapter housing as recited in independent Claim 1. In view of the above, Applicant submits that the rejection is deemed improper since Francescutte does not satisfy the essential requirement for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 2, 6 and 7 are dependent on independent Claim 1 and thus depend on subject matter deemed patentable for the reasons set forth above. Allowance thereof is also urged. With particular attention to Claim 7, Francescutte fails to disclose a sliding

apparatus including an extension in which the sliding apparatus is displaceable in a longitudinal axis of the housing so as to lock the fluorescent lamp in conjunction with a lower part of the housing on which the fluorescent lamp rests.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Francescutte as applied to Claim 1 above. This rejection is deemed overcome in view of the cancellation of Claim 5.

Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Francescutte as applied to Claim 7 above, and further in view of Chamba (U.S. Patent No. 6,748,986).

The Examiner is of the opinion that it would have been obvious to modify the adapter of Fransecutte to incorporate the sliding mechanism of Chamba in order to provide friction on the sliding part of the lamp holder. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration thereof is requested.

Unlike the present invention or the Fransecutte reference, the Chamba patent relates to a device for dispensing granular material in predetermined doses. More specifically, Chamba teaches a receptacle 32 having a size which complements the dimensions of a corridor of a housing 2 into which the receptacle is inserted. Under the effect of gravity, the granular material present in a hopper 37 flows into the receptacle 32. To remove a dose of granular material, an operator pulls on the receptacle 32. With particular attention to column 1, lines 32-40, the purpose of Chamba's dispenser is to overcome drawbacks by supplying a dispenser which is easy to handle, allows predetermined doses to be dispensed with excellent repeatability, and allows the product for dispensing to be stored under hygienic conditions.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references lack proper teaching, suggestion, or motivation for modifying the fluorescent lamp adapter of Fransecutte by incorporating a receptacle from Chamba's granular material dispenser in the manner proposed by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has also failed to provide sufficient support on how such a modification is to be made. The only way the Examiner could have arrived at his conclusion is through hindsight analysis by reading into the art the teachings of the Applicant. Hindsight analysis is clearly improper, since

the statutory test is whether "the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made."

Absent such teaching or suggestion, the invention as defined by Claim 8-10 is deemed fully patentable over the above references. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of Claims 8-10 is respectfully urged. Moreover, Claims 8-10 depend on subject matter deemed patentable for the reasons set forth above.

The Application with Claims 1, 2 and 6-10 is deemed in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully urged. Should the Examiner believe that minor differences exist which, if overcome, would pass the Application to allowance and that said differences can be discussed in a phone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Carlo S. Bessone
Reg. No. 30,547

OSRAM SYLVANIA INC.
100 Endicott Street
Danvers, MA 01923
(978) 750-2076